

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 18.94 Wis. Stats., a budget and regular meeting of the **Brown County Executive Committee** was held on Monday, October 24, 2016 in Room 200 of the Northern Building, 305 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Chair Lund, Vice-Chair Moynihan, Supervisor Van Dyck, Supervisor Hoyer, Supervisor Buckley, Supervisor Erickson, Supervisor Schadewald

Also Present: Supervisor Kneiszel, Supervisor Sieber, Supervisor Kaster, Internal Auditor Dan Process, Zoo Director Neil Anderson, County Clerk Sandy Juno, Finance Manager Dave Ehlinger, Senior Accountant Sandy Parmer, Director of Administration Chad Weininger, Human Services Director Erik Pritzl, Public Works Director Paul Fontecchio, Family Living Educator Judy Knudsen, Planning Director Chuck Lamine, HR Benefits Manager Tom Smith, Corporation Counsel Dave Hemery, Interim HR Director Peter Bilski, Airport Director Tom Miller, County Executive Troy Streckenbach, Technology Services Director August Neverman, Laura Workman, Beth Rodgers, Michael Keon, Kathy Radue, Jason Carviou, Renee Vande Voort, other interested parties, media

**Audio of this meeting is available by contacting the County Board office at 920-448-4015*

I. Call meeting to order.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Lund at 5:30 p.m.

II. Approve/modify agenda.

The following modifications were made to the agenda:

- Item 23 was struck;
- Item 31 will be held;
- Item 28 will follow Item 1

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve as amended. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

III. Approve/modify Minutes of October 10 and Special October 19, 2016 meetings.

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Comments from the Public – Budgetary Items

-Beth Rodgers, 311 W. Briar Lane, Allouez, WI

Rodgers addressed the Committee about the recommendation regarding employee benefits and some concerns she wants the Committee to hear. She said HIPAA specifically says a health plan cannot discriminate against individuals in the plan based on health factors and these health factors are spelled out and include health status and medical conditions. She feels this is tied very directly to the health assessment tests and scores that administration is recommending premiums be tied to. For example, high blood pressure, which is a medical condition called hypertension and high blood glucose which is a medical condition known as diabetes. Rodgers is concerned that the County is opening itself up to risk by discriminating and going against HIPAA.

She continued that the factors in the health assessments do not have a direct cause and effect with outcomes of serious health conditions. For example, everyone who has high cholesterol does not have a stroke or heart attack and everyone who is obese does not develop diabetes.

Rodgers is also concerned that these are almost arbitrary health factors. There could be other things and she mentioned skin cancer and that people with lighter colored skin are far more prone to skin cancer and therefore would it be appropriate to charge all Caucasians higher premiums?

Supervisor Buckley arrived at 5:35 pm

-Sandy Juno, 616 Dauphin Street, Green Bay, WI

Juno is a member of the Employee Benefits Advisory Committee which was formed last year to look at information and give input on behalf of the employees with regard to the benefit plan. The intent was to provide important information to the Board and avoid lengthy discussions on the Board floor on budget day. The committee started meeting in May at which time they were told there was a \$2 million dollar deficit in the fund. The committee was later told there was a \$3.8 million dollar deficit and late today, the committee was advised that there was an additional \$645,000 shortage. The numbers have been moving targets throughout the process. Juno emphatically said that as a committee they have done everything they possibly could to get input from the employees to work to figure something out that would be both fair to the employees and reasonable to the County. They came up with a proposal and met with the administration the Friday before tonight's meeting and the resolution which was left on the Supervisors' desks tonight was developed. They had worked with administration to do a weighted percentage on premium based upon the PHA and they also gave up the HRA dollars.

Juno continued that at 3:30 this afternoon, Benefit Advisory Committee member Jason Carviou was presented with a resolution from administration that totally changed the percentages of the premiums that they talked about previously. Juno said the new resolution changed the premiums from 12% to 17% but there was still no HRA dollars. She continued that based on the changes made and constantly changing numbers and the fact that the committee worked with administration in good faith, there is now a lack of trust of the administration. Juno is very frustrated and feels this is a disservice to the employees because they have not seen what has been brought to the committee this late in the game. She does not know where to go with this and urged the Board to look at it and see what the committee presented and noted that this is a self-funded plan. She feels it is important to have reasonable rates and premiums and noted that they have worked with administration to try to fix the \$3.8 million dollar deficit. She is devastated and noted that they have not received any explanation from administration regarding this nor has administration returned phone calls. Juno feels the employees should have decent wages and decent benefits and it is important to know the difference between wants and needs. She feels the proposed executive budget includes a lot of wants and she challenged the Board to weed out some of the wants and help give the employees what they deserve.

-Kathy Radue, 3468 Hickory Ridge Drive, De Pere, WI

Radue is also a member of the Benefits Advisory Committee and represents over 300 employees. She sent out the original proposal to her people based on all of the hard work of the committee and pretty much convinced the employees that since they have not had any increase in insurance costs in three years changes had to come and they would be big changes. Most people were pretty much accepting of this. Now, because of this late resolution from administration, she has to go back to all her people and tell them that things have changed. She said she uses all of her HRA dollars and gets 100% on the PHA. With the proposal as it currently stands, she will lose \$2,100 in HRA dollars, \$350 in wellness and, in addition, her premium will be going from 12% to 17%. She will lose about \$3,500 going into 2017 with these changes made at the last minute by administration. Radue has worked for the County for 26 years and feels like people are leaving the County every day because of things like this. She also said that receiving this new information from the administration a few hours ago has led to a lot of distrust and she questions what the real numbers really are.

-Mike Keon, 1742 Island Court, Green Bay, WI

Keon is also on the Benefits Advisory Committee and echoed what the others have said. The employees he represents have all received copies of what passed previously at the Administration Committee meeting. He said that on average employees gave up \$2,000 per year. Active employees gave up over \$2 million dollars in concessions and retirees gave up another \$1 million dollars. The new resolution that came out at the last minute takes another \$1,000 a year out of people's pockets. He feels this is unconscionable. The committee met last Friday and he finds it fishy that the correct numbers were not available then. Keon does

not know where this will end or how much more will be taken from employees to cut taxes by 3 cents. He is not asking anyone to raise taxes, but he feels that money could be found somewhere else. He wants to stick with what passed at Administration Committee even though it's not the best. This new resolution is ridiculous.

-Renee Vande Voort, 3083 Celestial Lane, Green Bay, WI

Vande Voort is also a member of the Benefits Advisory Committee. She said she represents quite a few employees and has worked very hard to explain to them what is going on. She finds a lot of employees do not trust the County with the health fund. She has tried to improve that and has tried to get the information out. Vande Voort said the fact there is another \$645,000 missing is just going to be another hit to the employees. She said the committee feels the resolution passed at Administration was the best that they could do. If the numbers are no longer the same, she would like to give the employees the option to have a say in whether or not they would like to go to the Humana plan that was offered that kept everyone at the 12%. She feels that would be fair and she knows it would be a hit to the Prevea people, but she feels that employees should be given the option and input since that was the point of putting the Benefits Advisory Committee together.

Jason Carviou, 205 Oak Street, Luxemburg, WI

Carviou was the last member of the Benefits Advisory Committee to speak. He thanked the Executive Committee for hearing from them and noted that he was charged with bringing the Benefits Advisory Committee recommendations to the Board. He said that at 3:30 today he was handed a new resolution claiming that there was an additional deficit of \$645,000. This came after Friday's meeting that was attended by HR and administration and everything was agreed on. Everything Carviou is going to recommend to the Committee tonight is based on the original numbers that were agreed to at the last meeting. He read from a report, a copy of which is attached, which outlines the recommendations of the Benefits Advisory Committee. The packet that was left on the Supervisors' desk is also attached.

Carviou continued that in light of the late developments by administration, he would like to hear their explanation regarding the additional deficit. He noted that he called the HR Director, Director of Administration and Finance Director, however, none of them returned his calls. He did get a visit from the HR Director but the math he presented did not add up to an extra \$645,000 deficit. Carviou noted that they had received a proposal from Humana for a fully funded plan which would take all of the administration out of the County's hands and administration would not have to be figuring out what the deficit really is. The premiums for the Humana plan were the same as what the employees currently have and the employees would not lose what they are posed to lose. He feels it is ridiculous to push such great losses on employees in one year and if the new numbers from administration are, in fact, correct, he would ask that the employees have the chance to consider the Humana plan. Carviou said that originally for the same price it was not worth losing Prevea as a provider, but with the new numbers he felt that most people would be willing to change doctors for the savings. He also said that these numbers are also being sprung on the Board just one week before the budget meeting.

Keon noted that through all this, administration keeps coming up with different numbers as to what the deficit is, but the actual premium that they are proposing has never gone up; the only thing that has gone up is the amount that the employees would pay. Carviou confirmed that what is going up is the employee's share, not the premium which means that the County will actually be paying less than what they are this year and the employees will be paying more. This is cost shifting onto the employees.

Carviou also addressed the last part of the resolution which is the 1% performance based bonus to be paid at the end of 2017. The position of the committee is set forth on the handout and Carviou reviewed this with the Board. He feels things need to change. It is hard to convince employees to stay at the County when they work hard and not only do they not get rewarded for that, they lose things every year. He would like the Committee to put a lot of thought into this and reminded them that what we are talking about are real people who will find these changes greatly impact their lives.

Juno pointed out one other change that she heard today regarding people who terminate having to use the HRA balance in 90 days. She said there is confusion as to if this applies to retirees as well as employees. In all fairness she feels that the retirees should have two years to use the HRA dollars. She feels this consideration should be given to people who have worked for the County for a number of years. It was clarified that the 90 days referred to the time that a claim would have to be submitted for services received before the termination date.

Vande Voort added that the Benefits Advisory Committee spent a great deal of time looking at this and trying to figure out how the employees can help balance this, but they would like to ask that the County look for a way to help balance this versus just asking the employees to balance it all on their own.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to suspend the rules and take Item 7 following item 28. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Communications

1. **Communication from Supervisor De Wane re: To look at funding the D.A.R.E. program for one year, while they get their much needed program back on the ground. *September Motion: To refer to the Executive Committee budget meeting.***

Supervisor Buckley said a motion was made at Public Safety to fund one additional D.A.R.E. officer at a cost of \$100,000. Supervisor Moynihan said he does not believe the \$100,000 is necessary because there is \$627,000 in the D.A.R.E. fund and further, the Sheriff did not ask for this. Buckley noted there is a reserve as indicated by Moynihan but there is only one position filled at this time in an attempt to make the money last as long as possible. The funds primarily came from parking at Packers games but that is pretty much dried up and they have not found another funding source of that magnitude. Buckley said one of the reasons De Wane put this communication forward was to have this put on the levy because the Board can request that the Sheriff use the money, but cannot direct him to utilize the money the way the fund is set up. Buckley said De Wane wants to see another officer added and Buckley does not disagree that we need another officer.

Director of Administration Chad Weininger explained that the D.A.R.E. account is separate from the County so the Sheriff and the organization have complete control over the dollars. The Sheriff did not request additional funding for a second deputy so De Wane put the communication in. Moynihan added that if Supervisors want to add it in, it is up to them, but he does not see the necessity to add to the fund that can already fund two officers for three years.

Supervisor Schadewald said he was on the Board when the D.A.R.E. program was started and he fully supports the program, but since finding out at 5:00 pm today that the County is \$645,000 in the hole with insurance he is not agreeable to spending \$100,000 for one position when the employees are taking such a financial hit. He would support receiving and placing this on file.

Supervisor Van Dyck said he also supports the D.A.R.E. program but he does not see the urgency and feels that there are other more urgent needs. He understands that the available fund will be used up over time if there is no other funding source, but he would like to deal with this next year or the following year. He asked how many officers there currently are. Buckley said there is only one D.A.R.E. officer covering the whole County at this point. He also said that kicking the can down the road is what got the County in trouble with the insurance issues and he does not want to see the same thing happen with the D.A.R.E. program.

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Van Dyck to receive and place on file. Vote taken. Ayes: Lund, Moynihan, Hoyer, Van Dyck, Erickson, Schadewald Nay: Buckley
MOTION CARRIED 6 to 1**

Non-divisional Budgets

2. County Executive – Review of 2017 department budget.

The County Executive proposed budget is set forth on Pages 257-259 of the budget book.

County Executive Troy Streckenbach said his department budget is basically a cost-to-continue budget. He highlighted the initiative outlined in the budget book regarding the Technology Transfer Center. As indicated in the conversation that took place at PD&T, Streckenbach's hope is that as they go through the process of implementing this they continue to identify more and more private sector partners. He will also be requesting funding from the State in the next biennial budget. Streckenbach continued that this all hinges on the ability of the UW System to give UWGB approval for the engineering. Without the engineering there will be no research park and the money will not be spent. Streckenbach would like to continue working on this and would like to see a three prong approach of State funding, community funding and county funding. This would lower the overall cost of building the structure and would also allow the County to continue working on showing the UW System along with the Chancellor at UWGB that the County is serious. Streckenbach is still also working on finding a solution for the UW Extension building that houses a number of entities and the goal would be to house them in this new facility. He said there is \$400,000 in the general fund specifically for developing this land for the research park. There has been some development on the land already and that is movement in a positive direction.

Streckenbach continued that about 40 – 50 community and business leaders attended a presentation by the Association for University Research Parks and the importance of making sure the County understands what they want to do with the land was stressed. It was also stressed that the County has to be patient and has to get over the hurdle that we do not have engineering degrees being produced here out of a four year college. Hence began the journey of trying to figure out how to get all of the learning institutions on the same page of the importance of the program in creating a pipeline for the future workforce and the ability in 20 years to have actual research and innovation taking place here. The new Chancellor at UWGB is very committed to increasing the overall enrollment at UWGB as well as how he can develop an engineering degree program and how he can increase the talent that is coming into Brown County. In the letter from the University President, it was indicated that this could be the single-most significant economic development decision made on behalf of Brown County and Streckenbach said it is extremely important to remember that we can be a true community partner in this overall strategy. He would like the Board to support the resolution that came out of PD&T.

Schadewald questioned the \$2,000 under advertising and public notice in the budget. Streckenbach explained that in the past they received a donation of \$2,000 which was used to promote the Discover Brown County initiative and it basically was a pamphlet that was created and distributed to children and families. His office is continually reviewing the process and this year they decided to move to an app format. The number one objective is to figure out how to use today's technology to get people more interested in things that we have in Brown County. The \$2,000 is in both the revenue and the expenses.

Erickson commented on the contributions in the amount of \$78,554 and asked if it was all to Advance. Streckenbach said that \$65,000 will be to Advance, \$10,000 will be to NEWEye and the rest will be available for any type of program that might come forward.

Van Dyck referenced the \$800,000 Streckenbach talked about earlier in connection with the Technology Transfer Center and asked if the Board would have consideration of this before the money is spent. Streckenbach said that right now it would be added to the overall bonding proposal but would be handled the same way bonding is currently done where a plan is formulated and then a bonding resolution is brought before the Board for vote. Van Dyck also asked about the \$10,000 in the budget for NEWEye and asked what the consequence would be if that was struck. Streckenbach responded that if the money was struck from the budget, NEWEye would not have the necessary funding to operate. Van Dyck thought the NEWEye project was supposed to be non-levy and was going to make money from all the things they were

going to do but this does not seem to be happening since numerous municipalities have pulled out of the project. Streckenbach was not aware of any municipalities pulling out. Weininger added that the salary for the person who runs NEWEye is fully funded by other municipalities and what the County Executive is talking about is additional money to film promotional videos. Streckenbach clarified that the only municipality that initially joined for 2017 has pulled out. The rest of the municipalities will be voting on this in their respective budget cycles and it is Streckenbach's understanding that all the municipalities that were in in 2016 will be in in 2017.

Schadewald asked about the increased expense for disability insurance because he thought the County was saving money in this area. Ehlinger responded that an increase notice was received from the vendor and then, subsequent to that, they got a price reduction, so the price reduction is sitting in general revenues as a lump sum figure rather than being spread to each department because of the lateness it came in. Weininger also noted that the wage increase is in there for now until everything is finalized with the budget.

Van Dyck spoke further about the NEWEye program. He would like the \$10,000 for the program cut from the budget. He said he did not like the program when it was proposed the last time and he still does not like it. He feels it is one of those feel good things and the County is making videos and doing other things but sometimes he thinks there are concerted efforts to put a lot of stuff out that nobody is interested in and nobody watches. Streckenbach said he recognizes Van Dyck's opinion that there is no value in the program but noted that when municipalities have an opportunity to examine the overall impact of what the program could do for their communities we could be back at the table looking at it.

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve the Executive's budget. Motion rescinded by Van Dyck; no vote taken.

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck to remove \$10,000 from the Executive's budget for the NEWEye program. No second; no vote taken.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve the Executive's budget. Vote taken: Ayes: Lund, Moynihan, Erickson, Hoyer, Schadewald Nay: Van Dyck

MOTION CARRIED 5 to 1

3. Board of Supervisors - Review of 2017 department budget.

The Board of Supervisors budget is set forth on Pages 253-256 of the budget book.

Board Chairman Pat Moynihan said the Board of Supervisors budget is pretty straight forward with the only caveat being the technology initiative of \$10,000.

Moynihan informed that later in the agenda the Committee will be considering a number of resolutions for things like wage changes and he wanted to make the Committee aware that he will be looking at the Board staff in the future. He wanted to do a reclass a couple years ago but was advised by the then HR Director that it was too late and he could not appeal. He feels it is important to recognize the good work done by the Board staff. He noted committee meetings are quite lengthy and there have been several other meetings added for which minutes must be taken. Moynihan feels the wages of the Board staff need to be looked at. He does not have a proposal right now, but will be looking at the office in its entirety in the future.

Schadewald would like to reduce the budget for postage from \$3,300 to \$300 because since he now has the iPad he no longer wishes to receive paper copies of mailings and he encouraged other Supervisors who have the iPads to do the same. Schadewald also asked if the copy expenses should be reduced because of the iPads. Moynihan recalled that when the program was started with the iPads the intent was to reduce the amount of paper and postage but noted that those who have iPads are still get hard copies in the mail until they feel comfortable and then, when they are comfortable with the iPads and with their permission, the Board office will stop sending paper copies.

Van Dyck commented that he appreciated Moynihan's attempt to bring the Board into the 21st century and he recalled an attempt a few years ago at passing a larger sum of money for software and other items but it was turned down. He understands that piece-mealing this may seem to be a more palatable approach, but in the end, if this is going to be effective, he feels the Board needs to get to the point of eliminating all the typing and videotaping and use the devices exclusively. He feels we need to go all or nothing but he understands that some Supervisors are reluctant to do this. He said unless we eliminate the recording, the manual typing and all the paperwork this is never going to work and we are going to spend money on iPads that end up sitting on a shelf somewhere.

Moynihan said that theoretically minutes only need to contain the action and motions for each agenda item, but there are Supervisors who want every word of the minutes typed verbatim which takes Board staff a long time. He feels minutes should reflect the motions and the actions but if Supervisors do not attend the meetings they want to be able to read the full written minutes. Lund feels what is needed is the technology to be able to skip around in the recordings to get to the part you are interested in instead of having to listen or view the entire meeting. Without that technology, this would be useless. Supervisors need to know the discussion along of the votes just to be transparent. Schadewald agreed but noted that he is aware that some Supervisors do not read the minutes. He says he hears every month questions about items that were discussed at meetings and are recorded in the minutes verbatim. Lund agreed and said that when Supervisors have questions, most times the answers are contained in the copies of the minutes. Alternatively, they could ask the members of the Committee or the Chair of the Committee their questions.

Streckenbach suggested the Board move away from hand-typed minutes and go to motion minutes and then have the meetings taped through NEWEye so the Supervisors could view them. This would create more transparency and community awareness and allow those who cannot attend meetings the access to view the content on the NEWEye website. He would suggest eliminating the paper copies and the mailings that go with it and move over to the technology that is available. Van Dyck responded that unfortunately NEWEye does not do what it needs to do and that would be to allow us to parse the meetings so we do not have to listen to the idle chit chat for two hours before getting to what they want to see.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to reduce mailing expense by \$300 and approve the Board of Supervisors budget as amended. Vote taken. Ayes: Lund, Moynihan, Erickson, Hoyer, Schadewald Nay: Van Dyck
MOTION PASSED 5 to 1

4. Capital Projects.

- a) Recommendation from PD&T to Executive Committee to increase bonding in an addition of \$2,046,710 to the Courthouse Dome Project which will increase the levy 2017 by \$3,228.**

The Capital Projects are set forth on Pages 260-291 of the budget book.

Public Works Director Paul Fontecchio directed the Committee's attention to Page 265 of the budget book. He informed the courthouse dome replacement was originally estimated at \$1,819,360. Since that estimate, a consultant has done an analysis of the dome and has come up with three options as outlined in the documents in the agenda packet. There is an option for copper roofing with an estimate of \$2,046,710; an option for copper colored aluminum roofing for \$1,807,715 and an option for copper coated steel roofing for \$1,919,246.

Fontecchio said the copper roofing will last 75+ years while the aluminum and steel would each last about 35 years. For the incremental difference, Fontecchio recommends going with the copper roofing at \$2,046,710. This is \$227,000 more than the original estimate, but the consultant estimate is much better than the original estimate in terms of more magnitude. Fontecchio said there are also some limestone issues that need to be addressed and those are included as well. Lund wants to be sure that future budgets include funds to maintain the dome so it either turns green or stays copper colored.

Fontecchio provided a handout, a copy of which is attached, that explains the various phases of the project as well as the fiscal impact and budgeted maintenance costs.

Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. Ayes: Lund, Moynihan, Erickson, Hoyer, Van Dyck Nay: Schadewald.

MOTION CARRIED 5 TO 1

- b) Recommendation from PD&T to Executive Committee to add to the Capital Projects bonding budget \$800,000 for architectural engineering of the STEM Innovation Center.**

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Debt Service.

Debt Service is set forth on Pages 292-299 of the budget book.

Weininger said typically the capital projects, debt services and special taxes and revenue are approved at Administration Committee. These items are before the Executive Committee because of the two proposed budget increases. The budget would stay as is but the \$227,000 for the courthouse dome project and the \$800,000 for the STEM Innovation Center engineering would be added. He also wished to clarify that the \$800,000 would have to come before the Board again before it would move forward.

Van Dyck asked what the total proposed debt issuance would be based on these changes. Weininger said the proposed debt issuance would go from roughly \$8.7 million dollars to roughly \$9.7 million dollars. The total outstanding debt would increase to approximately \$132 million dollars. Lund asked how much will be paid off this coming year and Weininger responded it would be roughly \$11 million dollars.

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Special Taxes and Revenue.

The special taxes and revenue are set forth on Pages 300-318 of the budget book.

Weininger informed that this refers to things that are not in other budgets such as shared revenue and wage adjustments.

Moynihan asked what the status of the Pulaski Library project is. Weininger said there is \$300,000 set aside for this project. The Village of Pulaski will have to raise about \$360,000 and the Library Board would work on a loan repayment plan for the \$300,000 before the project would move forward. Van Dyck said this is outside the realm of the Library Board because the Library Board does not have authority or money. If the County deems this is a good use of funds, it is the County's prerogative to go ahead and do so, but at this time the Library Board took no position because they feel there are higher priorities for the Library Board to deal with.

Schadewald referenced the \$260,000 for the Health Department move and asked if that was a better number than the last estimate. Weininger said it is his understanding that this is a very good estimate. Originally the estimate was pretty low and then there was another estimate that was extremely high. They met on this and fine-tuned it and Weininger feels this is an estimate that really encompasses the scope. The total projected cost of the move is about \$360,000. There was \$100,000 set aside in the 2016 budget so at the end of the year administration will be asking for a budget carryover for that amount and then this \$260,000 would be added to it. Schadewald asked for a timeframe on the move. Streckenbach responded that they are waiting for the Facility Subcommittee to come together and there are a lot of moving parts.

This is a request to assign some money that is in the general fund that would help facilitate the move. Streckenbach wants to be sure it is a move that makes sense in the long run and from continued conversations with Human Services and the Health Department he is pretty much convinced that it is the right move. Lund informed that the Facilities Masterplan Subcommittee will begin meeting in January, 2017 and he asked Streckenbach to keep the Committee advised of developments in this matter and his recommendations so nobody has to recreate the wheel. Streckenbach said he is focused on locations and downsizing government and not increasing the overall footprint. This move would save over \$100,000 annually and the County could use that money in different ways such as programs or benefits. Van Dyck asked why money is being set aside in advance of a plan. Streckenbach responded that the departments know where layouts are and said that if he feels the right thing to do is transfer the Health Department in 2017 it will be done.

Van Dyck also asked about the BCCA and fiber connection to the fairgrounds and St. Norberts loan for \$251,000. Streckenbach said this entire amount would be a loan that would be paid back. The most important part of this connection is to have a second backup and this would allow the County to have another line. Technology Services Director August Neverman explained that redundancy is a big deal and the main reason they are concerned about this from a Technology Services perspective is infrastructure support since a lot of services such as 911 are dependent on internet access. Currently the County does not have a second internet connection. If this is not done, it will be necessary for the County to get some sort of backup service with an estimated annual cost of \$56,000.

Streckenbach also wished to point out that it has been commented that they are balancing the budget by using fund balance, but the expenses being talked about here are all one-time expenses and are nonoperational-type of expenses. He wants to be clear that this is no different than what has been done in the past with a number of different programs or services for one-time needs.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Resolutions, Ordinances

7. Resolution Approving New or Changes to Existing Employee Benefits during the 2017 Budget Process.

Van Dyck asked Schadewald to refresh the Committee on what was approved at Administration Committee. Schadewald responded that what they referred was everything that was included in the resolution with the red marks on it, a copy of which is attached. The items in red are the changes made by the Benefits Advisory Committee. The Administration Committee did not make any recommendation with regard to a pay increase. Schadewald said the Administration Committee heard everything that was presented tonight by the benefits committee. The Administration Committee was working with the numbers they had on hand at the time and got it as fair as they could and that is where they through it was going to be tonight. Schadewald now wants to hear how the \$645,000 came to be and he feels if we can solve the \$645,000 problem, the original resolution would be acceptable.

The Committee was provided with a revised resolution, a copy of which is attached by Interim HR Director Peter Bilski. Lund asked for an explanation as to the \$645,000 deficiency. Bilski said this was a surprise and noted that the Benefits Advisory Commitment did an excellent job with this. In the process of running the numbers one last time the discrepancy was found and it was a surprise to everyone. Bilski thought the resolution that was approved at Administration Committee was going to be passed tonight, but now the problem of the shortfall has developed and it has to be dealt with.

Finance Manager Dave Ehlinger gave a little background. He said the Benefits Advisory Committee has invited him to attend their meetings and he attended many of them. He was off last Friday when the benefits committee met and said that at that time, the committee had everything available at the time. He started thinking about this and began to crunch some numbers over the weekend and found what he

believed to be the problem. What occurred was that the Executive's proposal was total expenses of \$18.4 million. The Benefits Advisory Committee recommended going down to \$17.3 million. If you take the \$17.3 million dollars times the 88% that the County should contribute (12% premium), it is approximately \$15.2 million dollars. Ehlinger wanted to verify that the \$15.2 million dollars was departmental revenue because his rough calculations said there would be a shortage of \$600,000 - \$700,000. Administration met today to determine if there is a flaw in his logic somewhere and between talking about it and figuring it out, they determined there was not a flaw. When they look at position control which says employee A is single so they will charge the department this or that for premium, it came up at \$14.6 million dollars being charged to the departments. \$14.6 million dollars versus the \$15.2 million dollars needed results in the rough figure of \$600,000. The bottom line is while the expense side is correct, the revenue side was short. An incorrect figure was put into position control which means that the individual department levies are not large enough to have the same amount that payroll would be charging out. Ehlinger said that if this deficit is not fixed this year, it will still be a problem in the 2018 budget. Accordingly, after everyone was in agreement that the math was correct a decision was made to put forward the proposal handed out tonight.

Schadewald asked if what Ehlinger is saying is that in order to have an accurate budget, the \$645,000 is what is needed as revenue. Ehlinger agreed. Schadewald said the difference between what Administration Committee and the Benefits Advisory Committee agreed to and the employees thought they were going to get and the plan that was just handed out tonight is \$645,000 in extra cost to the employees. Ehlinger said that that was the proposal. Schadewald said we have to find out where we can get \$645,000 to get back to the original plan that was agreed on. That amount of money on the tax levy is a little over 4 cents. The pay increases total roughly \$850,000 and Schadewald said that one option would be to take it out of pay increases, but he did not want to do that.

Schadewald asked what the general fund transfer policy is. Weininger explained that there is a structural deficit whether you keep it in the fund or outside the fund so it would be better to keep it in the fund. The problem is that there is only \$2.4 million dollars in health fund balance that is unrestricted and if there were five or six high cost claims that could be depleted. Weininger would be very concerned about using fund balance because it is somewhat of a gamble and further, there would need to be adjustments made the following year as well.

Schadewald wants to lay out the options and they would be to increase the levy, find \$645,000 to cut from the budget or shift it all to the employees. Buckley feels this is a good opportunity to challenge fellow Supervisors who want to add to the budget and not address this part. He would like to see this the priority at budget time versus wanting money for other things. He continued that administration has worked the numbers and maybe the employees should share a small part of this. Schadewald disagreed and said the employees are already taking significant hits and he does not want to cut them more.

Weininger said there is \$2.4 million dollars in the unrestricted health account and there is an additional amount to cover the HRAs. Schadewald asked what the implication to the County would be if \$400,000 was taken from the unrestricted dollars to apply to the deficiency. Weininger responded that next year the levy would need to be increased, there would need to be plan design changes or changes to the percentages the employees paid. Schadewald noted that \$3.8 million dollars has been cut with the agreements already made, and perhaps taking \$400,000 from the health account would be an option. Buckley reminded the committee that \$100,000 has also been cut for the D.A.R.E officer.

With regard to the revenue side of the calculation done by administration, Van Dyck asked if when they looked at the total prior revenue, if it stuck out that the prior revenue was X and the new revenue was \$600,000 more. Ehlinger said in hindsight it should have, but what they had to do was look at the revenue in the health and dental fund versus the expense in every other fund and in theory they should have been the same but they were not. Ehlinger is confident that the current revenue number is accurate but noted that there is some variance because staffing levels have changed due to Family Care. Van Dyck asked if the \$600,000 was an ongoing issue. Ehlinger said it was and said that for a single there is \$215 in the system for

the department charge. To get to the \$17.3 million that is needed for expenses and then the 88% percent of that, they need \$225 so there is roughly a \$10 shortage per single person per pay period. The scenario for family is a shortage of about \$25.00 per pay period. Taking the shortages and multiplying them by the number of employees and then by the number of pay periods, it comes up to \$640,000.

Van Dyck asked if Humana was the only company that came forward with a proposal. Benefits Manager Tom Smith said that during the summer they went out for quotes on insurance plans. The quotes were presented to the Benefits Advisory Committee and they were all significantly higher than the current plan. At the last minute, Humana resubmitted a quote with reduced pricing. Van Dyck said that insurance companies play games all the time and he does not think that the Humana plan is necessarily the answer. Weininger said that to be fair to Humana, they did cap it at 11% increase and also indicated that they would drop that if they participated in the wellness program and also purchased the dental plan. Van Dyck continued that he is not a fan of the tiering system. He thinks if people want to be healthy, they want to be healthy because that is their choice. He agrees, for example, that tobacco users incur more health issues, but if the cost of cigarettes does not change someone's mind, he does not think charging extra on the insurance is going to make a difference either. The point he is trying to make is he is all for promoting health, but it should not be done in a way where people are penalized or rewarded for things that should be a conscientious choice.

Bilski said he has some ideas as to how the shortfall can be handled and he would like to get something worked out tonight. He would like to meet with his insurance people and either come back tonight or come back tomorrow with some ideas. Schadewald told him that he can bring something back at any time prior to the budget meeting. Lund wanted to be sure that Bilski understood, though, that the Committee does not want to see this going on the backs of the employees.

Lund feels this Committee should make a recommendation that we do not want to raise premiums tonight and go through with what we originally had in front of us and whatever is decided on the wages and then we can figure out if we have to cut items in the budget or handle this in some other way. Schadewald recalled that the Executive's budget had figured 17% premiums so what happened was this was cost shifted down to 83% so the budget is not apples to apples. When the \$645,000 was discovered, the shortfall was in those revenue streams. Schadewald agreed that the Board can find some cuts, but he feels that at least \$400,000 needs to be taken out of the health account. He understands that may create a structural deficit for a year but the employees have already done a great job and he feels sorry that they had to make the cuts they did. The \$400,000 would be something that they have a year to figure out before the next budget and he Schadewald feels the employees would appreciate this. This would leave \$245,000 more in cuts and Schadewald would like Bilski to bring any ideas he has to the budget hearing where we can either not take the \$400,000 out or where to find the \$245,000.

Van Dyck said the other thing in the resolution is the wage increase and he feels that we should have a conversation with that while administration goes back and produces the correct resolution for review. The Committee discussed wage increases. Weininger said a 1% COLA across the board effective January 1, 2017 would cover everyone except for the employees represented by unions. The most they can negotiate with the union members are .68%. Weininger would also like to have a conversation regarding who gets the 1% and who does not based on calculations. Schadewald wants to give the employees a wage increase because that was part of the employee benefits discussion. If a performance-based amount is given, the salary never increases. Then when someone needs to be hired, that is when you get the people coming in making more than people have who worked for the County for years. The other reason to give a base wage increase is because the HRAs were taken away so with a wage increase, it is forever.

With regard to the 1% calculation, Ehlinger said that the people that it would not include is Syble Hopp and ADRC because they have already budgeted for it in their departments. The steps for correctional officers would go up by 1% and it would also include 1% for sworn officers and 1% Library staff. The figure of the expense is about \$743,000, levy effect of roughly \$582,000. The Executive's budget has \$572,000 so there is

a variance of about \$10,000. The people who are excluded, the same rationale would be used with the 1 2 3 plan. It does not include the limited-term employees and Ehlinger has excluded those positions from the calculations.

Moynihan said it is a shame the Board cannot entertain a larger increase for the employees. Buckley asked for clarification as to what positions would not be included in the 1%. Ehlinger said it is basically the limited term employees and passed out a list, a copy of which is attached. Buckley wants to be sure that this is crystal clear to alleviate any questions at budget time.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to give employees a 1% base wage adjustment as of January 1, 2017. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion by substitution made by Supervisor Erickson to include the up to \$500.00 bonus for full-time employees and the up to \$250.00 bonus for part-time employees who make \$79,999 or less. Failed for lack of second.

The Committee next discussed the section regarding HRA balances and termination/retirement. Smith said that the way he interprets this is if an employee is to continue on retiree coverage or take COBRA continuation coverage, they would be eligible to use the HRA dollars. Schadewald asked if language should be added that people who retire have two years to use the HRA dollars. A discussion ensued regarding the difference between *retirement* and *termination*. Weininger said that when an employee is going to retire, they go to HR and fill out a retirement form. That would be the definition of retirement. Smith said those retirees are few and far between versus the intent of this which is getting the money back from the employees who quit to go to another job. Smith felt it would be fiscally responsible to let the employees who retire spend their HRA dollars over a two year period.

Ehlinger said that the roughly \$17.3 million dollars for expenses includes a credit of \$153,000 for the assumption that there will be savings to the County for 90 days versus two years and he asked if this credit should be taken out of the calculation. Lund responded that it would have to be parsed by how many retirements there are going to be compared to separations. You would just do the average retirements per year to figure out the cost. Ehlinger said that the \$153,000 was an estimate and Lund said it should just be left as an estimate and then in next year's budget they will know how many people retired so there will be an average amount of people who retire and an average amount of separations.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to add language that states employees who retire will continue to have two years to spend down their available HRA balance. Vote taken. Ayes: Lund, Moynihan, Erickson, Hoyer, Schadewald, Van Dyck Nay: Buckley. MOTION CARRIED 6 TO 1

The next part of the discussion concerned the VEBA accounts. Schadewald noted that the Benefits Advisory Committee asked that VEBA administration fees become the employees' responsibility at the end of 2017, not 2016. Ehlinger said that that would have a dollar amount of \$35,000. Schadewald said they went through this at Administration Committee and felt that they will start having the employees pay the administration fees of the VEBA on their own. Van Dyck feels there are bigger fish to fry with this and he feels that extending this a year will just promote people waiting 12 more months to figure out what they have to do. Keeping it at the end of 2016 will make people decide what they have to do with it sooner rather than later.

Juno said the reason they were looking to start paying it in 2018 was because there has not been a lot of communication as to who has VEBA dollars and by going out a year it would allow people time to run down the VEBA dollars before taking on the additional fee. She noted employees did not ask to be in the VEBA, they had an HSA but were moved into the VEBA. At one time they were told the monthly fees were \$9 and another time they were told the fees would be \$3-4 if they went to another vendor. Lund asked what the

\$35,000 cost of the VEBA is and Ehlinger said that it was an estimated amount. Smith said that in August when he looked this up there were 488 participations, 88 were terminated employees so there were 400 employees at \$9.00 each would be \$36,000. There is another vendor they could look at that would reduce costs to about \$4.50 per person. Schadewald pointed out that the lower vendor would not save the County any money, but it would save the employees some money. Van Dyck asked if the VEBA funds could be liquidated into some other type of fund and he would like a legal opinion on that. If there is no opposition to the employees spending the funds, he feels we should just get rid of the account.

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to approve the resolution with the modifications made and direct HR and administration to resolve the \$645,000 fund balance shortfall. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- 8. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the *Child Support* Table of Organization and the *Corporation Counsel* Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- 9. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the *Human Resources* Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- 10. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the *Technology Services* Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- 11. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the *Medical Examiner* Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- 12. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the *Brown County Library* Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- 13. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the *NEW Zoo* Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- 14. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the *Zoo and Park Management* Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**15. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the
Health Department and Human Services Department Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**16. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the
Human Services – Community Programs Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**17. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the
Airport Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**18. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the
Planning and Land Services Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**19. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the
Port and Resource Recovery Department Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**20. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the
Public Works Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**21. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the
Public Works Table of Organization Changing the Allocation of Costs for Certain Positions.**

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**22. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the
Public Works – Facility Management Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**23. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the
Public Works Table of Organization.**

This item was struck from the agenda.

**24. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the
Register of Deeds Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor Van Dyck to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**25. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the
U.W. Extension Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**26. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the
Public Safety Communications Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**27. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2017 Budget Process in the
Sheriff's Department Table of Organization.**

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to approve. Vote taken.
Ayes: Schadewald, Hoyer, Lund, Moynihan, Erickson Nay: Van Dyck
MOTION CARRIED 5 to 1

NON-BUDGET REVIEW

Comments from the Public – Non-Budgetary Items. None.

Communications

28. Communication from Supervisor Erickson re: Request consideration of increasing the daily fee for use of jail by municipalities on civil forfeiture bench warrants from \$40.00 per day to \$200.00 per day. Issue is use of jail for collection of fines – jail overcrowding – cost to house. *Referred from October County Board.*

Erickson recalled that he submitted a communication at the last County Board meeting which was referred to Public Safety and then to the Criminal Justice Coordinating Board. The above communication is something that the Criminal Justice Coordinating Board suggested and it is now before this Committee.

Buckley said this appears to be another case where the issue never went before the Sheriff's Department or the Public Safety Committee which would be the parent committee. He is not sure if the full ramifications are understood or what the ultimate goal of increasing the cost per day from \$40 to \$200 is and asked Erickson for further explanation. Erickson said it is his understanding that people are being picked up on Fridays and placed in jail for the weekend on small bench warrants. This is costing the County three days in jail and the people turn around on Monday or Tuesday and pay the warrant and are cleared. If the daily charge is increased, the community is going to have to decide if they want to pursue these small bench warrants by putting these people in jail and costing the County, which is the municipalities, several days of incarceration. Buckley responded that if the municipalities decide they do not want to pick people up for the small warrants, there would be no teeth and it would actually pay to commit a crime. Erickson commented that maybe the fines should be bigger. Buckley said the City of Green Bay would have to pay another half million dollars to house inmates under this proposal, or, alternatively they wouldn't issue any warrants at all because they do not want to pay increased jail costs. The result would be no teeth in any type of municipal action so the warrants will become irrelevant. Then what will happen is the police, instead of picking someone up on a disorderly conduct and issuing a municipal citation and sending them on their

way, they will take them on a state charge and lock them up and then not only will the jail be more full, but the DA's office will also be affected with an overabundance of work which is actually going to end up costing more money. Buckley said if this would have been taken to the Sheriff's Department or Public Safety this could have all be explained.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Van Dyck to refer to Public Safety Committee for consideration and analysis. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Reports

29. County Executive Report.

No report; no action.

30. Human Resources Report.

No report; no action.

Resolutions/Ordinances

31. Ordinance to Amend Sections 4.49 and 4.57 of the Brown County Code of Ordinances Entitled, Respectively, as "Extra Pay" and "Policy". Held for 30 days.

This Item was held.

32. Ordinance to Amend Section 4.57 of the Brown County Code of Ordinances Entitled "Policy". Referred to Exec from October County Board.

Bilski said the direction he received last time with regard to this item was to come back with several costs. Including vacations and holidays in the computation of overtime and applying that principal to all departments and adding in WRS and FICA would amount to \$103,367. He would be remiss if he did not say that there is also some application to some of the administrative departments and he feels adding \$30,000 for that would be appropriate which would bring this to approximately \$133,000. Lund asked if Bilski took into account that some of this would be paid by the State for the Highway Department and if he subtracted out the Airport because they are an enterprise fund. Bilski said that he did account for State payments to the Highway Department. The Airport itself accounted only for about \$1,300 of this.

Erickson asked about the holidays and vacation days and what it had to do with anything. Bilski said that that was for proposal one off of Fontecchio's original letter. Erickson said that what we are talking about here is overtime over scheduled hours. For example, if someone is scheduled to work 40 hours and they works 10 hours Monday and Tuesday, they would have a total of four hours overtime, but if they were to take vacation on Friday, it would not make a difference. Once 40 hours hit, it triggers the overtime. Erickson said the vacation time would count towards the hours. Lund said that under the Fair Labor Standards Act a person cannot get overtime until after they work 40 hours, unless the organization would so will.

Bilski continued that to be along the line where anything outside of the hours is in essence overtime, it would be \$169,000 countywide plus the \$30,000 would also have to be added for a total of about \$199,000. Bilski also noted that he was charged with a rewrite of Chapter 4. This proposal would be in essence everything outside the eight hour window. He said it always gets pricy when you are talking about anything beyond the eight hours or beyond the schedule because it hits in so many other ways.

The third proposal was for only the winter plowing months. Bilski said that applying that countywide would be about \$111,000 plus the \$30,000, but it would be a little more difficult to convince other departments that this made sense.

Schadewald asked Bilski for his opinion as the Interim HR Director as to which recommendation would be best. Bilski replied that in terms of cost effectiveness it would be vacation and holidays included. Schadewald clarified that what he is referring to would be to change the Code to say that vacation and holiday hours now count toward the 40 hours which would lead to more overtime payments. Bilski responded that that was correct. Schadewald asked if this is really changing Section 4.57 or if it is a different part. Schadewald said that somewhere in Code 4 it says that vacation and holiday hours do not count toward the holiday time. Corporation Counsel Dave Hemery said the language is currently set forth in Section 1.

Van Dyck said he understands this, but if there is \$133,000 to spend, he would rather see it given out as wages across the board. He does not necessarily disagree with this, he is just looking at it as going into the budget meeting next week being \$645,000 short on the health insurance and he feels that there will probably be other things that come up as well, and if we are going to expend \$133,000 he would rather see it benefit everyone instead of only those that may be impacted by overtime.

Schadewald said there are many employees throughout the County that struggle with the idea that they are working over 40 hours including their vacation and holidays and not getting paid overtime when they are asked to come in at night or on holidays and weekends and he thinks this is a good first step. His proposal is that this be piece-mealed because you can only do so much so often. There are people at the 911 center, the sanitarians, Highway Department, Airport, CTC, etc. that this would affect. He does not see this as a cure-all but sees it as more of a part of a package. He will be looking for cuts wherever possible to come up with the money while maintaining the flat rate. He said there are a fair number of employees that get that overtime should be compensated. He is looking at a total package of a 1% wage increase and changes to the health insurance and this is something that the employees who work overtime would appreciate.

Erickson agreed with Schadewald and elaborated that the vast majority of this ordinance change pertains to 24/7 employees. If there is a bad snow day, the staff at the CTC has to go in, sanitarians have to work, airport people and plow drivers are all working but everyone else can call in and take vacation or sometimes he hears that the County is shut down. The plows don't shut down, the CTC doesn't shut down, the 911 center doesn't shut down. These are all of the services that are most needed and all he wants to do is compensate these people fairly for getting up in the middle of the night and working holidays and losing time with their families. He backs this and feels very strongly about it and feels the employees deserve it.

Weininger asked if this would take effect upon passing or starting in 2017. It was indicated that the intent was for it to start in 2017. Weininger also asked if the Committee wished to increase the special taxes and revenues to increase the levy amount in wages by that amount so we are not creating a structural deficit in 2017. Weininger said that the Ordinance could be passed tonight and then considered at the budget meeting and then the funds could be provided in the wage adjustment line to cover the \$133,000. Bilski said that the \$133,000 would have to be added to the levy or cut from somewhere else.

Van Dyck said this is really far off of where it originally started, but he understands how we got here because there was a concern that we needed to look at this across the whole county so this was a new twist on what was originally proposed. He also understands that it would probably help correct certain situations that exist, but he would also ask that the potential of this causing issues be considered. It seems that sometimes when things are done, there is a positive effect, but then it creates a negative effect in the sense that sometimes people are working the system in the opposite direction. He would like the department heads to take a look to see if there are situations that this could cause things that they don't want to cause. Lund understood what Van Dyck was saying but feels it is up the department heads to manage the overtime. If there is no snow, for example, the plow drivers should not be working overtime.

Fontecchio said that by example, in the month of December, he can allow a number of plow drivers to be off for vacation, but he can allow two to be unavailable and this is the tough part. If he goes less than two, he will hit minimal staffing which will sacrifice plow routes. If the rest of the people are on vacation and it

snows, then he needs these guys to come in and if they were on vacation all week, they come in and plow snow at straight time until they reach 40 hours. Van Dyck asked about the opposite direction when the hours were worked and then they want time off because they know they will get paid overtime. Lund said that this would be for people who were scheduled off and Fontecchio would have to manage this so it doesn't become an issue.

Erickson commented that Fontecchio has basically three different shifts and they are all designed that when it snows they automatically go to a certain shift, and by doing that they have actually been able to reduce overtime at Public Works and a high percentage of that work is actually paid back by the State and municipalities. Erickson brought this up specifically for plow drivers and airport personnel and it was expanded from there. There will definitely be a reduction in overtime the way the program is laid out now.

Schadewald said Van Dyck brought up a good point and said we are trying to help the employees. If there are employees in any department that game this, we will find out about it there could be consequences. He will charge the managers with watching this and if the system is being gamed policies will be enacted to deal with it.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to delete the word *not* in Code 4.57, Section 1 so it reads "are considered hours worked" effective January 1, 2017. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to reconsider Taxes and Special Revenue. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to adjust the wage adjustments by \$133,303 and change that line to \$1,080,000. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Other

33. Such other matters as authorized by law. None.

34. Adjourn.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to adjourn at 8:53 pm. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio
Recording Secretary

Executive Committee Meeting – October 24, 2016

Thank you for taking the time this evening to hear from the Benefits Advisory Committee. My name is Jason Carviou, 206 Oak Street Luxemburg, WI 54217. I am employed as a Financial Specialist in the County Treasurer's Office, and also an elected member of the Benefits Advisory Committee representing the Division of Administrative Services. I am here on behalf of the Benefits Advisory Committee to present our recommendations for your consideration.

First, I would like to draw your attention to the first 4 pages of your packet. This is a salary impact analysis of the original proposal on healthcare presented by the County Executive that I was asked to conduct by Supervisor Schadewald. The first page assumes a 5% employee premium contribution increase and a 1% salary increase for 2017. The column on the right shows what the net difference would be to an employee's salary on a spectrum depending on base salary. As you can see, any employee that makes less than \$80,000 and has a family healthcare plan will have less take home pay in 2017 than in 2016 – and that assumes a 1% salary increase. The next 3 pages also assumes a 5% employee premium contribution increase and a 1% salary increase for next year, but it also factors in the impact of a 50% reduction to HRA contributions. With this added factor, every employee that makes \$100,000 or less with a family plan will now see a decrease in their salary; between \$250 - \$1680 less in 2017. Our recommendations do nothing to lighten this burden on employees; however they do help cushion the effect employees will feel on their paycheck, which is where most employees have indicated they would feel it the most.

Brown County is in direct competition with other municipalities to hire and retain top talent; however we have a turnover rate of 10 – 12 % per our Human Resources Department. With those rates, we have the definition of a revolving door retention policy. It is the erosion of benefits and low salary increase expectations which is driving this trend. Turnover is expensive – costing anywhere between one month and one year of salary depending on the skillset and level of expertise for the position. Right now, we are merely a stepping stone to the next level when what we really want is to be the place that others envy. To do so we need to reevaluate the way we think about benefits and compensation. We ask that you keep this in mind and point the County in the right direction.

We recommend that all HRA contributions be eliminated in 2017. This would allow enough savings to keep the employee contribution for premiums at a weighted 12%. We would also recommend a tiered system for premiums based on the results of employees' PHA scores with the tiered percentages being 11%, 11.5%, 12%, 13%, 20%, and 25% for the gold, silver, bronze, standard, tobacco users, and non-participant categories respectively. We also ask you direct HR to make changes to the RAS program (Reasonable Alternative Standards) to make it

goal-oriented. The current structure is not reasonable, which causes people to not even try. A goal oriented system does not require someone to lose 25, 50, or 100 pounds in a few weeks or months in order to improve your PHA to receive an incentive. Instead it gives that incentive for making progress, for say, losing 5-10% of the weight. The idea is to reward progress and provide motivation to keep going.

Furthermore, we would also recommend that remaining HRA dollars be eligible for 213D expenses in 2017, and that employees' start paying their own VEBA administration fees starting January 1, 2018 instead of January 1, 2017. VEBA accounts were opened on behalf of employees without their discretion to rollover funds from their HRA accounts. The extra year will allow employees to explore options to spend down their VEBA accounts or transfer that money to another savings account if eligible without incurring administrative fees.

We also recommend that retirees pay for a percent of claims by the retiree pool in addition to their full premiums. The retiree pool accounts for a \$1 million deficit to the healthcare plan with a funding loss ratio of nearly 285% through the first 7 months of 2016. In contrast, the current employees had a funding loss ratio of 94% through the same time period. We believe that this change is necessary to achieve the long term solvency of the County's healthcare plan.

These changes will result in an additional \$70,000 in savings to the healthcare plan versus the original proposal. We would like to see you allocate that \$70,000 to the wellness portion of the healthcare plan, and direct HR with advisement from the Benefits Advisory Committee to develop and maintain a meaningful wellness program for the County. The County is currently lacking the tools and resources necessary that would allow a transformation to healthier lifestyles. In the end everyone wins because employees are healthier, there are fewer claims, and fewer claims means lower premiums.

These are the committee's recommendations regarding the healthcare proposal. We also have recommendations regarding the proposed 1% performance based bonus to be paid in the end of 2017. We recommend a 1% base wage salary increase effective January 1, 2017 and a flat rate performance based bonus of up to \$500 for full-time and \$250 for part-time employees payable at the end of 2017. According to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average salary in the Green Bay area rose about 2.4% from June 2015 to June 2016. If we want to change the revolving door policy, we need to become more competitive and start rewarding employees who work hard. It doesn't make sense to give your lowest performing employee a larger raise than your best employee because one wasn't at market value and one was at market value. It also doesn't make sense that new employees are being hired at higher starting salaries than employees that have been here for several years, which is caused by not increasing base wage salaries therefore not keeping up with market prices of people entering those positions. Both situations have or are happening in the County.

These are all the recommendations that the Benefits Advisory Committee has to make. We want to thank you again for forming this committee, and giving employees an outlet to be heard.

November 2, 2016

(Revised at Admin Committee on October 5, 2017)

Employee Benefits Advisory Committee Proposed Changes in red.

TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Ladies and Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION APPROVING NEW OR CHANGES TO EXISTING
EMPLOYEE BENEFITS DURING THE 2017 BUDGET PROCESS**

WHEREAS, the Brown County Executive submits a proposed budget to the Brown County Board of Supervisors for their consideration each year; and,

WHEREAS, this resolution reflects the changes to Brown County employee benefits contained in the 2017 budget.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Brown County Board of Supervisors, the following changes to the employee benefits requested through the 2017 budget process to be effective January 1, 2017; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, premium contributions will be ~~17% for all covered employees~~ weighted per the chart below for all covered employees. The premium rate will be based upon the individual Personal Health Assessment Score, subject to non-participants having the option to test prior to the benefit year starting; and,

Personal Health Assessment (PHA) Level and Points	Percent Paid of Total Cost	Coverage	Amount per Month
Non –Participant	25%	Single / Family	\$127.88 / \$340.32
Tobacco User	20%	Single / Family	\$102.30 / \$272.26
Standard (60 Points and below)	13%	Single / Family	\$66.50 / \$176.96
Bronze 61 – 70 Points	12%	Single / Family	\$61.38 / \$163.36
Silver 71 – 85 Points	11.5%	Single / Family	\$58.52 / \$156.54
Gold 86 – 100 Points	11%	Single / Family	\$56.26 / \$149.74

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Health Reimbursement Account (HRA) contributions will be reduced by 50% for all covered employees. Contributions will continue to be based upon the Personal Health Assessment (PHA) result.~~

PHA Level and Points	HRA % County Contribution	County Contribution Amounts Single/Family
Non-Participant	0%	\$0
Tobacco User	20%	\$105 / \$210
Standard < 60 Points	40%	\$210 / \$420
Bronze 61 — 70 Points	60%	\$315 / \$630
Silver 71 — 85 Points	80%	\$420 / \$840
Gold 86 — 100 Points	100%	\$525 / \$1,050

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, employees wishing to improve their PHA Score will be outcome based, requiring employees to retest to validate the change in their Points and Funding levels. Scores will be retroactive back to the beginning of the year, for both improvements, and declines in the new results.~~

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, employees wishing to improve their PHA Score will be outcome based, requiring employees to retest to validate the change in their points and premium levels. If employees think they are unable to meet a standard for a reward under this wellness program, they may qualify for an opportunity to earn the same reward by a different means Reasonable Alternative Standard (RAS). Improvements will be retroactive to the beginning of the year for the employee premium; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, there will be no quarterly contributions to the Health Reimbursement Account (HRA), nor any wellness incentives added; and,

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, HRA dollars may no longer be utilized for 213d eligible expenses. The HRA dollars may only be utilized to meet deductibles, co-insurance payments, and co-pays. HRA funds in excess of the single/family deductible on December 31 of the benefit~~

~~year, will be forfeited and will no longer be rolled over into the following benefit year, or into a VEBA.~~

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, employees who terminate employment with Brown County will have 90 days to submit claims for services received prior to their termination date. After 90 days, funds will return to the county's General Health Fund.~~

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, employees who terminate employment with Brown County who have a HRA balance, will have 90 days to submit claims for services received prior to their termination date. After 90 days, unused balances will return to the county's General Health and Dental Fund; and,

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the county's administrator for the Voluntary Employee Beneficiary Association (VEBA), will change from Brown County to the individual employee account holders. Employees who have a VEBA account will pay their own monthly administrative fees.~~

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the payment of administration fees for the Voluntary Employee Beneficiary Association (VEBA), will change from Brown County to the individual employee account holders. Employees who have a VEBA account will pay their own monthly administrative fees through an automatic deduction from their account **as of December 31, 2017**; and,

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, Long Term Disability Payments will reduce to 60% of a person's salary up to \$5,000 monthly, and will now end at the Social Security Normal Retirement Age (65).~~

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, Long Term Disability Payments will reduce to 60% of a person's salary up to \$5,000 monthly, and will now end at the individual's Social Security Normal Retirement Age; and,

Authored by Human Resources

Approved by Corporation Counsel's Office

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ROLL CALL # _____

Motion made by Supervisor _____

Seconded by Supervisor _____

SUPERVISORS	DIST. #	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN	EXCUSED
SIEBER	1				
DE WANE	2				
NICHOLSON	3				
HOYER	4				
GRUSZYNSKI	5				
LEFEBVRE	6				
ERICKSON	7				
ZIMA	8				
EVANS	9				
VANDER LEEST	10				
BUCKLEY	11				
LANDWEHR	12				
DANTINNE, JR	13				

SUPERVISORS	DIST. #	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN	EXCUSED
BRUSKY	14				
BALLARD	15				
KASTER	16				
VAN DYCK	17				
LINSEN	18				
KNEISZEL	19				
CLANCY	20				
CAMPBELL	21				
MOYNIHAN, JR.	22				
BLOM	23				
SCHADEWALD	24				
LUND	25				
BECKER	26				

Total Votes Cast _____

Motion: Adopted _____ Defeated _____ Tabled _____

EXAMPLE	SALARY	PLAN TYPE	CURRENT EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION	CURRENT MONTHLY EMPLOYEE PREMIUM	CURRENT YEARLY EMPLOYEE PREMIUM	PROPOSED EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION	PROPOSED MONTHLY EMPLOYEE PREMIUM	PROPOSED YEARLY EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION	INCREASED COST TO EMPLOYEE	PERCENT REDUCTION TO EMPLOYEE SALARY	1% WAGE INCREASE	NET DIFFERENCE TO EMPLOYEE SALARY
EMPLOYEE A	\$20,000.00 /YEARLY \$9.62 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00%	\$88.29 \$234.96	1,059.51 2,819.46	\$ 311.62 \$ 829.25	1.56% 4.15%	\$200.00 /YEARLY \$0.10 /HOURLY	(\$111.62) (\$629.25)
EMPLOYEE B	\$30,000.00 /YEARLY \$14.42 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00%	\$88.29 \$234.96	1,059.51 2,819.46	\$ 311.62 \$ 829.25	1.04% 2.76%	\$300.00 /YEARLY \$0.14 HOURLY	(\$11.62) (\$529.25)
EMPLOYEE C	\$40,000.00 /YEARLY \$19.23 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00%	\$88.29 \$234.96	1,059.51 2,819.46	\$ 311.62 \$ 829.25	0.78% 2.07%	\$400.00 /YEARLY \$0.19 HOURLY	\$88.38 (\$429.25)
EMPLOYEE D	\$50,000.00 /YEARLY \$24.04 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00%	\$88.29 \$234.96	1,059.51 2,819.46	\$ 311.62 \$ 829.25	0.62% 1.66%	\$500.00 /YEARLY \$0.24 HOURLY	\$188.38 (\$329.25)
EMPLOYEE E	\$60,000.00 /YEARLY \$28.85 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00%	\$88.29 \$234.96	1,059.51 2,819.46	\$ 311.62 \$ 829.25	0.52% 1.38%	\$600.00 /YEARLY \$0.29 HOURLY	\$288.38 (\$229.25)
EMPLOYEE F	\$70,000.00 /YEARLY \$33.65 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00%	\$88.29 \$234.96	1,059.51 2,819.46	\$ 311.62 \$ 829.25	0.45% 1.18%	\$700.00 /YEARLY \$0.34 HOURLY	\$388.38 (\$129.25)
EMPLOYEE G	\$80,000.00 /YEARLY \$38.46 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00%	\$88.29 \$234.96	1,059.51 2,819.46	\$ 311.62 \$ 829.25	0.39% 1.04%	\$800.00 /YEARLY \$0.38 HOURLY	\$488.38 (\$29.25)
EMPLOYEE H	\$90,000.00 /YEARLY \$43.27 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00%	\$88.29 \$234.96	1,059.51 2,819.46	\$ 311.62 \$ 829.25	0.35% 0.92%	\$900.00 /YEARLY \$0.43 HOURLY	\$588.38 \$70.75
EMPLOYEE I	\$100,000.00 /YEARLY \$48.08 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00%	\$88.29 \$234.96	1,059.51 2,819.46	\$ 311.62 \$ 829.25	0.31% 0.83%	\$1,000.00 /YEARLY \$0.48 HOURLY	\$688.38 \$170.75

EXAMPLE	SALARY	PLAN TYPE	PREMIUM	CURRENT EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION	CURRENT		PROPOSED	
					MONTHLY EMPLOYEE PREMIUM	YEARLY EMPLOYEE PREMIUM	MONTHLY EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION	YEARLY EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION
EMPLOYEE A	\$20,000.00 /YEARLY \$9.62 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	\$ 519.37 \$ 1,382.09	12.00% 12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00% 17.00%	
EMPLOYEE B	\$30,000.00 /YEARLY \$14.42 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	\$ 519.37 \$ 1,382.09	12.00% 12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00% 17.00%	
EMPLOYEE C	\$40,000.00 /YEARLY \$19.23 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	\$ 519.37 \$ 1,382.09	12.00% 12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00% 17.00%	
EMPLOYEE D	\$50,000.00 /YEARLY \$24.04 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	\$ 519.37 \$ 1,382.09	12.00% 12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00% 17.00%	
EMPLOYEE E	\$60,000.00 /YEARLY \$28.85 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	\$ 519.37 \$ 1,382.09	12.00% 12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00% 17.00%	
EMPLOYEE F	\$70,000.00 /YEARLY \$33.65 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	\$ 519.37 \$ 1,382.09	12.00% 12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00% 17.00%	
EMPLOYEE G	\$80,000.00 /YEARLY \$38.46 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	\$ 519.37 \$ 1,382.09	12.00% 12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00% 17.00%	
EMPLOYEE H	\$90,000.00 /YEARLY \$43.27 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	\$ 519.37 \$ 1,382.09	12.00% 12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00% 17.00%	
EMPLOYEE I	\$100,000.00 /YEARLY \$48.08 /HOURLY	SINGLE FAMILY	\$ 519.37 \$ 1,382.09	12.00% 12.00%	\$62.32 \$165.85	\$747.89 \$1,990.21	17.00% 17.00%	

PROPOSED MONTHLY EMPLOYEE PREMIUM	PROPOSED YEARLY EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION	INCREASED COST TO EMPLOYEE	PERCENT REDUCTION TO EMPLOYEE SALARY	1% WAGE INCREASE	NET DIFFERENCE TO EMPLOYEE	
					SALARY	CURRENT HRA FUNDING
\$ 88.29	\$ 1,059.51	\$ 311.62	1.56%	\$200.00 /YEARLY	(\$111.62)	\$210 - \$1,050
\$ 234.96	\$ 2,819.46	\$ 829.25	4.15%	\$0.10 /HOURLY	(\$629.25)	\$420 - \$2,100
\$ 88.29	\$ 1,059.51	\$ 311.62	1.04%	\$300.00 /YEARLY	(\$11.62)	\$210 - \$1,050
\$ 234.96	\$ 2,819.46	\$ 829.25	2.76%	\$0.14 HOURLY	(\$529.25)	\$420 - \$2,100
\$ 88.29	\$ 1,059.51	\$ 311.62	0.78%	\$400.00 /YEARLY	\$88.38	\$210 - \$1,050
\$ 234.96	\$ 2,819.46	\$ 829.25	2.07%	\$0.19 HOURLY	(\$429.25)	\$420 - \$2,100
\$ 88.29	\$ 1,059.51	\$ 311.62	0.62%	\$500.00 /YEARLY	\$188.38	\$210 - \$1,050
\$ 234.96	\$ 2,819.46	\$ 829.25	1.66%	\$0.24 HOURLY	(\$329.25)	\$420 - \$2,100
\$ 88.29	\$ 1,059.51	\$ 311.62	0.52%	\$600.00 /YEARLY	\$288.38	\$210 - \$1,050
\$ 234.96	\$ 2,819.46	\$ 829.25	1.38%	\$0.29 HOURLY	(\$229.25)	\$420 - \$2,100
\$ 88.29	\$ 1,059.51	\$ 311.62	0.45%	\$700.00 /YEARLY	\$388.38	\$210 - \$1,050
\$ 234.96	\$ 2,819.46	\$ 829.25	1.18%	\$0.34 HOURLY	(\$129.25)	\$420 - \$2,100
\$ 88.29	\$ 1,059.51	\$ 311.62	0.39%	\$800.00 /YEARLY	\$488.38	\$210 - \$1,050
\$ 234.96	\$ 2,819.46	\$ 829.25	1.04%	\$0.38 HOURLY	(\$29.25)	\$420 - \$2,100
\$ 88.29	\$ 1,059.51	\$ 311.62	0.35%	\$900.00 /YEARLY	\$588.38	\$210 - \$1,050
\$ 234.96	\$ 2,819.46	\$ 829.25	0.92%	\$0.43 HOURLY	\$70.75	\$420 - \$2,100
\$ 88.29	\$ 1,059.51	\$ 311.62	0.31%	\$1,000.00 /YEARLY	\$688.38	\$210 - \$1,050
\$ 234.96	\$ 2,819.46	\$ 829.25	0.83%	\$0.48 HOURLY	\$170.75	\$420 - \$2,100

PROPOSED HRA FUNDING	PERCENT REDUCTION TO EMPLOYEE SALARY	TOTAL PERCENT REDUCTION TO EMPLOYEE SALARY (PREMIUM AND HRA)	<u>TOTAL NET DIFFERENCE TO EMPLOYEE SALARY</u>
\$0 - \$525	1.05 - 2.62 %	1.61 - 4.18 %	(\$321.62 - \$636.62)
\$0 - \$1,050	2.10 - 5.25 %	6.25 - 9.40 %	(\$1,049.65 - \$1,679.25)
\$0 - \$525	0.70 - 1.75 %	1.74 - 2.79 %	(\$221.62 - \$536.62)
\$0 - \$1,050	1.40 - 3.50 %	4.16 - 6.26 %	(\$949.25 - \$1,579.25)
\$0 - \$525	0.53 - 1.31 %	1.31 - 2.09 %	(\$121.62 - \$436.62)
\$0 - \$1,050	1.05 - 2.63 %	3.12 - 4.70 %	(\$849.25 - \$1,479.25)
\$0 - \$525	0.42 - 1.05 %	1.04 - 1.67 %	(\$21.62 - \$336.62)
\$0 - \$1,050	0.84 - 2.10 %	2.50 - 3.76 %	(\$749.25 - \$1,379.25)
\$0 - \$525	0.35 - 0.88 %	0.87 - 1.40 %	\$78.38 - (\$236.62)
\$0 - \$1,050	0.70 - 1.75 %	2.08 - 3.13 %	(\$649.25 - \$1,279.25)
\$0 - \$525	0.30 - 0.75 %	0.75 - 1.20 %	\$178.38 - (\$136.62)
\$0 - \$1,050	.060 - 1.50 %	1.78 - 2.68 %	(\$549.25 - \$1,179.25)
\$0 - \$525	0.26 - 0.66 %	0.65 - 1.05 %	\$278.38 - (\$36.62)
\$0 - \$1,050	0.53 - 1.31 %	1.57 - 2.35 %	(\$449.25 - \$1,079.25)
\$0 - \$525	0.23 - 0.58 %	0.58 - 0.93 %	\$378.38 - \$63.38
\$0 - \$1,050	0.47 - 1.12 %	1.39 - 2.04 %	(\$349.25 - \$979.25)
\$0 - \$525	0.21 - 0.53 %	0.52 - 0.84 %	\$478.38 - \$163.38
\$0 - \$1,050	0.42 - 1.05 %	1.25 - 1.88 %	(\$249.25 - \$879.25)

Courthouse Dome Replacement Fact Sheet

October 24, 2016



Public Works Facility Management is implementing a three-phase replacement project for the original Brown County Courthouse dome (constructed 1912). This project includes the replacement of the historic Courthouse copper dome and the restoration of the existing exterior limestone and historic clock faces. This project will be completed in following three phases:

Phase I – Needs Assessment (*Fall 2016*)

This phase includes a needs assessment, existing condition assessment and documentation, structural analysis, invasive materials testing & analysis, and project scope and budget verifications.

Phase II – Construction Documents (*Winter 2016/2017*)

This phase is scheduled to be completed in early 2017 and will include the design development and necessary detailed architectural and engineering plans, specifications and construction cost estimates for successful public bidding and construction.

Phase III – Construction (*beginning Spring 2017*)

This phase is scheduled to begin the spring of 2017 with completion late fall of 2017. Construction will include the replacement of the historic Courthouse copper dome and the restoration of existing exterior limestone, mortar joints and clock faces that were originally constructed in 1912.

Fiscal Impact

Requesting approval of \$2.05 million CIP funding in the 2017 Brown County Budget.

Budgeted Maintenance Costs

To keep the new copper dome appearance “bright and shiny” will require budgeting \$15,000 to \$20,000 annually for periodic cleaning and re-sealing (every four to six years). Budgeting for this maintenance will start in 2018.

Operating Budget Impact:

The full replacement of the copper dome roof along with restoration of the existing exterior limestone and clock faces will extend the life of the Brown County Courthouse, reduce future maintenance and repair costs and prevent water damage to the historic interior paint, plaster detailing and rendered murals inside the Courthouse.

4a

November 2, 2016
(Revised at Admin Committee on October 5, 2017)

TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Ladies and Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION APPROVING NEW OR CHANGES TO EXISTING
EMPLOYEE BENEFITS DURING THE 2017 BUDGET PROCESS**

WHEREAS, the Brown County Executive submits a proposed budget to the Brown County Board of Supervisors for their consideration each year; and,

WHEREAS, this resolution reflects the changes to Brown County employee benefits contained in the 2017 budget.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Brown County Board of Supervisors, the following changes to the employee benefits requested through the 2017 budget process to be effective January 1, 2017; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, premium contributions will be ~~17% for all covered employees.~~ weighted per the chart below for all covered employees. The premium rate will be based upon the individual Personal Health Assessment Score, subject to non-participants having the option to test prior to the benefit year starting; and,

Personal Health Assessment (PHA) Level and Points	Percent Paid of Total Cost	Coverage	Amount per Month
Non –Participant	25%	Single / Family	\$127.88 / \$340.32
Tobacco User	20%	Single / Family	\$102.30 / \$272.26
Standard (60 Points and below)	13%	Single / Family	\$66.50 / \$176.96
Bronze 61 – 70 Points	12%	Single / Family	\$61.38 / \$163.36
Silver 71 – 85 Points	11.5%	Single / Family	\$58.52 / \$156.54
Gold 86 – 100 Points	11%	Single / Family	\$56.26 / \$149.74

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Health Reimbursement Account (HRA) contributions will be reduced by 50% for all covered employees. Contributions will continue to be based upon the Personal Health Assessment (PHA) result.~~

PHA Level and Points	HRA % County Contribution	County Contribution Amounts Single/Family
Non-Participant	0%	\$0
Tobacco User	20%	\$105 / \$210
Standard < 60 Points	40%	\$210 / \$420
Bronze 61 — 70 Points	60%	\$315 / \$630
Silver 71 — 85 Points	80%	\$420 / \$840
Gold 86 — 100 Points	100%	\$525 / \$1,050

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, employees wishing to improve their PHA Score will be outcome-based, requiring employees to retest to validate the change in their Points and Funding levels. Scores will be retroactive back to the beginning of the year, for both improvements, and declines in the new results.~~

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, employees wishing to improve their PHA Score will be outcome based, requiring employees to retest to validate the change in their points and premium levels. If employees think they are unable to meet a standard for a reward under this wellness program, they may qualify for an opportunity to earn the same reward by a different means Reasonable Alternative Standard (RAS). Improvements will be retroactive to the beginning of the year for the employee premium; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Health Reimbursement Account (HRA) Contributions and HRA Wellness Contributions will be reduced by 100%; and,

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, HRA dollars may no longer be utilized for 213d eligible expenses. The HRA dollars may only be utilized to meet deductibles, co-insurance payments, and co-pays. HRA funds in excess of the single/family deductible on December 31 of the benefit~~

~~year, will be forfeited and will no longer be rolled over into the following benefit year, or into a VEBA.~~

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, employees who terminate employment with Brown County will have 90 days to submit claims for services received prior to their termination date. After 90 days, funds will return to the county's General Health Fund.~~

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, employees who terminate employment with Brown County who have a HRA balance, will have 90 days to submit claims for services received prior to their termination date. After 90 days, unused balances will return to the county's General Health and Dental Fund; and,

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the county's administrator for the Voluntary Employee Beneficiary Association (VEBA), will change from Brown County to the individual employee account holders. Employees who have a VEBA account will pay their own monthly administrative fees.~~

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the payment of administration fees for the Voluntary Employee Beneficiary Association (VEBA), will change from Brown County to the individual employee account holders. Employees who have a VEBA account will pay their own monthly administrative fees through an automatic deduction from their account; and,

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, Long Term Disability Payments will reduce to 60% of a person's salary up to \$5,000 monthly, and will now end at the Social Security Normal Retirement Age (65).~~

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, Long Term Disability Payments will reduce to 60% of a person's salary up to \$5,000 monthly, and will now end at the individual's Social Security Normal Retirement Age; and,

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, retiree premiums will be increased to cover the loss that group has incurred from the prior year.~~

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, retiree health insurance premiums will be increased to cover the projected loss for the retiree cost pool for the calendar year 2016; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the county's third party administrator for Workman's Compensation claims will switch from Willis of Wisconsin to Wisconsin Municipal Mutual Insurance Company; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the county will switch its' Pharmacy Plan Benefit Manager to RX Benefits Express Scripts; and,

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, all employees will receive a one percent (1%) performance based pay bonus.~~

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, employees will be eligible for up to a one percent (1%) performance based pay bonus to be paid out at the end of year; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the vendors named on the attached spreadsheet are the current vendors approved for the 2017 Benefits.

Budget Impact: *The changes in this resolution will result in an operational deficit of \$645,641.76 in the 750 Health and Dental Fund for the 2017 Budget.*

Respectfully submitted,
ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE &
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approved By:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE (Date)

COUNTY CLERK (Date)

COUNTY BOARD CHAIR (Date)

Authored by Human Resources

Approved by Corporation Counsel's Office

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ROLL CALL # _____

Motion made by Supervisor _____

Seconded by Supervisor _____

SUPERVISORS	DIST. #	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN	EXCUSED
SIEBER	1				
DE WANE	2				
NICHOLSON	3				
HOYER	4				
GRUSZYNSKI	5				
LEFEBVRE	6				
ERICKSON	7				
ZIMA	8				
EVANS	9				
VANDER LEEST	10				
BUCKLEY	11				
LANDWEHR	12				
DANTINNE, JR	13				

SUPERVISORS	DIST. #	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN	EXCUSED
BRUSKY	14				
BALLARD	15				
KASTER	16				
VAN DYCK	17				
LINSEN	18				
KNEISZEL	19				
CLANCY	20				
CAMPBELL	21				
MOYNIHAN, JR.	22				
BLOM	23				
SCHADEWALD	24				
LUND	25				
BECKER	26				

Total Votes Cast _____

Motion: Adopted _____ Defeated _____ Tabled _____

Comp and class pay increase excluded employees					
Administration	LTE-Public Information Officer				1
Circuit Courts	LTE - bailiffs				15
Clerk of Courts	LTE -- Emergency help, clerk/typists				3
Community Programs	Psychiatrist				2
Community Treatment Center	Clinical Director				1
Community Treatment Center	Adult Psychiatrist				1
Community Treatment Center	LTE -- Co-op/student intern				2
Community Treatment Center	LTE -- Nurse practitioner				2
Community Treatment Center	On-call dietician				3
County Clerk	LTE -- Election help canvasser				2
District Attorney	LTE -- Co-op intern and/or emergency help				6
Golf Course	LTE -- Summer or seasonal				18
Human Resources	LTE -- Extra help				1
Medical Examiners	Medical examiner investigators				8
NEW Zoo	LTE -- Concessionaire Supervisor				11
NEW Zoo	LTE -- Concessionaire I				24
NEW Zoo	LTE -- Husbandry Assistant				4
NEW Zoo	LTE -- Zoo Educator				1
NEW Zoo	LTE -- Seasonal maintenance worker				1
Parks & Adventure Park	LTE -- Emergency help, multiple job titles				44
Planning and Land Services	LTE -- Co-op/student intern				1
Port & Resource Recovery	LTE -- Co-op/student intern				2
Public Works - Facilities	LTE -- Summer help				2
Public Works - Highway	LTE -- Highway maintenance worker				1
Public Works - Highway	LTE -- Summer employee				15
Sheriff	LTE -- Court security				7
Sheriff	LTE -- Crime Analyst				1
Technical Services	LTE -- Co-op/student intern				1
Treasurer	LTE -- Tax collection help				6
UW Extension	LTE -- Emergency help, multiple positions				10
Total					196
Departments with separate calculations					
Aging & Disability Resource Center		Already included in their budget			
Library	Not included in Class & Comp plan				Separate calculation
Sheriff	Sworn officers				Separate calculation
Sheriff	Correctional officers (in steps)				Separate calculation
Syble Hopp	Not included in Class & Comp plan				Already included in their budget
Elected officials -- salary cannot be changed while in office					
Clerk of Courts	Elected officials				1
County Board	Elected officials				26
County Clerk	Elected officials				1
County Executive	Elected officials				1
Register of Deeds	Elected officials				1
Sheriff	Elected officials				1
Treasurer	Elected officials				1